

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 189

EA 001 696

By -Carnell, Paul H.

Federal Support for the Small College.

Pub Date Aug 68

Note -18p.: Paper presented to Annual Summer Workshop of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (13th, Santa Fe, N. Mex., Aug. 5-8, 1968).

EDRS Price MF -\$0.25 HC -\$1.00

Descriptors -Cooperative Programs, *Federal Aid, *Federal Programs, Fellowships, *Higher Education, *Research Proposals, *Small Schools

Identifiers -Education Professions Development Act, Part E, Higher Education Act of 1965, Title 3

This paper reviews briefly the development and scope of Federal support programs to higher education which relate to the problems of the small college, and discusses in detail Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and Part E of the Education Professions Development Act. Weaknesses of proposals submitted last year for Title III funding are cited. The evaluation of cooperative arrangements, which are the central focus of Title III, is discussed concerning (1) individual institutions in cooperative arrangement, (2) structure of the cooperative arrangement, and (3) character of the cooperative programs. Part E of the Education Professions Development Act supports fellowships, institutes, short term training programs, and special projects. (HW)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

"FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE SMALL COLLEGE"

by

Paul H. Carnell
Assistant Director
Division of College Support
Bureau of Higher Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

13th Annual Summer Workshop of the Council

for the Advancement of Small Colleges

August 5-8, 1968
College of Santa Fe, New Mexico

ED023189

EA 001 696

"FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR THE SMALL COLLEGE"

In looking at the total spectrum of higher education, it is apparent that the 4-year private college faces some special problems--problems which in some ways are more serious than those faced by other sectors of higher education. Among these perplexing problems are: How can the small college achieve financial stability? How can the small college compete in the academic market place for highly qualified faculty? In what ways should the small college modify its curriculum? But perhaps the most important and the most difficult question is how can the small college define, develop, and implement a viable mission (or missions) in our rapidly changing structure of higher education? You who are so vitally concerned with the future of the small college are well aware of these problems and I shall not elaborate on them. Instead, I shall review briefly the development and scope of Federal programs of support to higher education with some focus on those programs which relate to the problems of the small college and shall then talk in more detail about two programs with which I am most familiar--Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and Part E of the Education Professions Development Act.

The Federal government is deeply involved in providing support for higher education. An indication of the extent of this support is seen in the fact that during the period 1963-66 Federal obligations to universities and colleges totaled over \$8 billion. The U.S. Office of Education alone is

spending annually about \$1 billion for higher education.

The rise in Federal support to this high level began during World War II when large sums were awarded to universities for scientific research and development in connection with the war effort. Federal support of research continued to increase after the war. It was not until the late 1950's and early 1960's that Federal programs for higher education achieved a much broader purpose--to serve a wide variety of needs in higher education. These programs were established by an unprecedented number of laws passed during that period which were concerned with higher education. These included the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 and the Education Professions Development Act.

This legislation has substantially increased the level of Federal support for higher education. To what extent has the small college benefited from this increase?

It is evident that, a few years ago, the small colleges received only a small percentage of the total Federal funds for higher education. In 1966 the 100 institutions obtaining the largest amounts of Federal support received 70% of the total Federal funds for higher education. In 1963, these same 100 schools had received 85% of the funds. Almost all of these 100 institutions were the larger universities.

Fortunately, the proportion of Federal funds going to small colleges has increased since 1963. In that year only one per cent of all obligations

to colleges and universities by the Department of Health, Education, and

Welfare went to institutions granting only the bachelor's degree. By

1966 this percentage had risen to 8 per cent. There has also been a marked trend in recent years to disperse Federal funds more widely to a greater number of institutions and to provide increasing support for undergraduate education.

This trend toward broader support is reflected in a number of specific Federal programs. I shall outline briefly those Federal programs which are providing significant amounts of support to the small college:

- (1) The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provides loans and grants for construction of undergraduate facilities. In fiscal year 1968, grants totaling almost \$285 million were awarded to colleges and universities under this program for the construction of undergraduate facilities. Loans totaling \$150 million were awarded for both undergraduate and graduate construction. (It should be remembered however, that assistance for construction of academic facilities is available only in cases where it will result in a needed substantial expansion of enrollment capacity.)
- (2) The Federal student financial aid programs provide support to undergraduate students at a great number of colleges. A large majority of the accredited institutions of higher education in this country participate in one or more of these programs. They include the National Defense Student Loan Program, the Educational

Opportunity Grants Program, the College Work-Study Program and the Guaranteed Student Loan Programs.

- (3) Title VI-A of the Higher Education Act provides grants for the purchase of equipment and materials to improve undergraduate instruction, such as audiovisual, laboratory, and television equipment.
- (4) Title II-A of the Higher Education Act provides grants to strengthen and increase library resources of colleges and universities through acquisition of books, periodicals, and other library materials. This program has been especially beneficial to the 4-year college. In fiscal year 1967, over \$10 million or 44.5% of Title II-A funds went to 4-year institutions.
- (5) The Cooperative Research Act provides grants to encourage personnel of small colleges to gain experience in educational research. It also provides support to encourage the development of educational research capabilities in small or developing colleges and the application of the results of this research to their on-going programs.

These programs I have mentioned are administered by the Office of Education. Other Federal agencies also support small colleges. The National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities supports faculty exchange and cooperative programs in the humanities at some small colleges. The

National Science Foundation provides substantial support for the improvement of undergraduate education in the sciences. The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers a program of loans for construction of college housing facilities which undoubtedly has been of benefit to many of the smaller colleges.

I have tried to give you a fairly complete list of all Federal programs which may benefit the small college. As you can see, these programs are designed to meet rather specific needs--for new facilities, instructional equipment, improved science education, etc. The two programs I shall discuss next--Title III of the Higher Education Act and Part E of the Education Professions Development Act--are designed to provide a much broader approach to the needs of institutions of higher education. Title III seeks to increase the basic strength of developing institutions through cooperative arrangements by providing grants to support faculty and administrative improvement, curriculum change and development, improvement in student services, student and faculty exchange, visiting scholars, National Teaching Fellows, and other programs. This broad support is providing many small colleges with money to meet their basic needs and to re-examine their goals. At this time, I would like to share with you some statistics for Title III that reveal some of the directions the program is taking:

Table 1.

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Funds appropriated and obligated	\$ 5M.	\$30M	\$ 30M	\$30M ?
Funds requested by institutions	32M	57M	110M	
Proposals submitted	310	560	500	
Grantee developing institutions	127	411	220	
Other developing institutions	31	55	142	
National Teaching Fellowships	263	1,514	727	
Geographical representation	38 States and D.C.	47 States, D.C., Guam, and Puerto Rico	45 States Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	

Grants by Type of Institution

	<u>Number</u>		<u>% of Grantees</u>		<u>Average Grant</u>		
	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>
4-year Public	28	73	22	18	45,463	105,349	148,755
4-year Private	64	215	51	52	41,047	73,067	158,135
2-year Public	19	73	15	18	42,293	55,279	98,840
2-year Private	16	50	12	12	38,799	51,292	80,576

(In FY 1968, 14 CASC colleges will be receiving \$1,271,501 under Title III.)

In relation to future Title III funding, we are of course very interested in improving the quality of proposals which are submitted by the developing colleges. With this goal in mind, I would like to share with you some of the major weaknesses of the proposals that were submitted last year:

1. Fragmentation

Some proposals consisted of a list of rambling, disconnected odds and ends of programs that someone had jotted down in an apparent rush effort to get some Federal money. In other words, the plans for improvement did not show much planning. Careful planning should result in a well-coordinated and well-integrated cooperative arrangement that would (or could) have a major impact on the institution or institutions involved.

2. Inadequate Case for Being a "Developing" Institution

An institution must qualify as "developing" to be considered for support under Title III. A number of proposals did not make a strong defense for the "developing" character of the applying institution. You should make your case as "a developing institution" very clear and concise for the readers and staff. Remember that the word "developing" is not a static word--developing means change and this means that the profile of your institution (and the universe of developing institutions) must and will change from year to year.

3. Inadequate Defense of Program Need

Let the readers know the real need for the programs which you are requesting and how these programs relate to the long-range, major goals of your institutions. In some proposals the whole program emphasis was on activities to be engaged in rather than accomplishments to be achieved. Some institutions seemed to request programs simply because they were listed as line items on the budget forms.

4. Inadequate Defense of Budget

Frequently the relation between the proposed program and the proposed budget was neither clear nor adequately defended. Budget defense is very important. If you request \$1,000 for instructional materials for a given program, let the readers know why you feel this is vital to the success of the proposed program.

5. Inadequate Description of Institutional Development Under Title III

If you are currently receiving Title III support, the relationship of your new request to previous support should be given careful attention. Your new request should flow from and be intimately meshed with your current programs. Your narrative should include a discussion indicating what Title III has done to help your institution and how continued support would amplify this forward thrust. What changes have occurred because of Title III support which make your institution more viable?

6. Equipment Requests

Some proposals received low priority for funding because of large dollar requests for equipment. Title III is a program oriented Title. Equipment support is minimal and then only for items absolutely essential to the program.

7. Weak Cooperative Arrangements

Some proposals satisfied the requirement of the law by persuading an assisting institution to sign the appropriate page in the application. But it was not possible to find any significant elements of cooperation except perhaps a vague reference which said "They are going to help us find visiting scholars or National Teaching Fellows." If you are proposing a cooperative arrangement, show clearly and completely what the significant elements of cooperation are in the programs proposed.

Since the last item relates specifically to the central focus of Title III (i.e., cooperative arrangements) I would like to spend some time discussing with you some areas of concern in our evaluation of cooperative arrangements. These are:

- A. Individual institutions in the cooperative arrangement;
- B. Structure of the cooperative arrangement;
- C. Character of the cooperative programs.

The following comments result from a personal review of 283 different proposals for cooperative arrangements involving some 278 colleges. The cooperative

arrangements were approximately equally divided between bilaterals (a developing institutions cooperating with an assisting institution) and consortia (two or more developing institutions in a cooperative arrangement).

A. Individual institutions in the cooperative arrangement

1. Has each of the participating institutions in the cooperative arrangement made a serious effort to define and develop its mission?

Are they really aware of the kind of job they are now doing? In looking to the future, what are they trying to become and why?

This effort directed to institutional understanding must involve a complete and honest look at the whole spectrum of academic and fiscal strengths and weaknesses and a clear definition of goals stemming directly from the areas of strengths and weaknesses.

2. Assuming that an institution understand what it is trying to do and why and has established viable goals for the future, why has this institution decided to participate in a cooperative arrangement?

a. Because of a genuine belief that the goals of the institution cannot be achieved without cooperation with other institutions of higher education; or

b. Because of a genuine belief that cooperative arrangements, particularly consortia, have a plus rating with the Federal government and foundations and hence this route to additional dollars is quick and sure.

B. Structure of the Cooperative Arrangement

1. **Effective leadership.** Is the cooperative arrangement structured so that it will function with competent, responsible leadership which is sensitive not only to the needs of the individual participating institutions but also to the needs of the total cooperative endeavor. The latter is essential to successful consortia arrangements. Effective leadership can come from high potential developing institutions who are coordinating a cooperative arrangement; from strong assisting institutions or agencies; or from a well-qualified administrative staff that has been given enough authority to influence the success of the cooperative arrangement in a significant way.
2. **Kinds and number of institutions** - In relation to the goals of the participating institutions, what advantages or disadvantages for the cooperative arrangement become apparent in relation to the following:
 - a. **Geographical distance** between participating institutions. How does the distance factor relate to the kinds of cooperative programs that have some promise for success?
 - b. **Institutional Homogeneity** - Two-year, four-year, public, private, character, and size of student body and faculty, uniformity of college calendars, accreditation, etc. Is the mix of institutions too heterogeneous for any real cooperation?

c. Total number of institutions participating. Are the institutions over-involved in too many cooperative arrangements?

d. Academic and fiscal strengths and weaknesses of the individual participating institutions. Are the cooperating institutions too weak to really help each other?

e. Participation of a given institution in a variety of cooperative arrangements simultaneously (consortia and bilaterals):
What are the factors to be considered in relating a given institutions bilateral involvement to the development of a strong consortium?

C. Character of the Cooperative Programs

1. Are there unique and special long-range advantages that will accrue to all of the participating institutions as a result of the cooperative arrangement that could not be achieved equally well, or perhaps better, on an individual basis?
2. Do the programs have promise for aiding the long-range basic needs of the participating institutions? (This includes requests for National Teaching Fellows.)
3. Is the program emphasis primarily on the extension of current programs rather than effective sharing of existing assets with a goal of greater efficiency? (Examples of the latter are joint purchasing of services and supplies; joint fund raising; cooperative

use of facilities and personnel; cooperative administrative

procedures--registration, student selection and record processing.

4. Are the programs realistic? Will the personnel needed be available? Is there a high probability of the objectives being achieved? Is there evidence that the participating institutions are anticipating the day when substantial Federal funds may not be available for supporting the cooperative programs.

5. Do the programs requested appear to have been imposed on the participating institutions or generated by them? Is there good evidence of mutual participation in the planning and execution of the cooperative arrangement?

Cooperative arrangements between institutions of higher education need to be encouraged and strengthened. The areas of greatest concern are:

1. The development of strong leadership.
2. The need for much more effective communication between participating institutions.
3. The development of programs which will have a massive impact on the basic needs of the participating institutions.

Successful cooperative arrangements can mean the survival of some institutions of higher education. Beyond this goal however lies the very real and exciting possibility that successful consortia will become the universities of tomorrow with a quality of excellence equal to or greater than that of our best universities.

The Division of College Support also administers Title V, Part E of the Education Professions Development Act--a broad and flexible Act designed to meet a wide variety of critical needs for trained manpower in higher education. This Act supports fellowships, institutes, short-term training programs, and special projects. The essential components of the Act may be summarized as follows:

What persons are eligible for fellowships?

Those who are serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in institutions of higher education. Fellowships support full-time graduate study in programs other than those eligible for support under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act.

What persons are eligible for institutes or short-term training programs?

Those who are serving or preparing to serve as teachers, administrators or educational specialists in institutions of higher education. This would include faculty, trustees, presidents, deans, media specialists, counselors, development officers and others.

What institutions may apply for a grant?

Any institution of higher education that meets the eligibility requirements described in the General Provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Only institutions with well-established graduate programs should apply for graduate fellowship support.

Duration and type of institute or fellowship

Regular-session institute	Full time (Academic yr.) 9-12 mos.	Part time
Short-term institute	Full-time (Summer) 6-8 weeks	Part-time
Short-term training	Full time Less than 4 weeks	Part time

Institutions may offer various combinations of these training programs with a 12-month limitation. Fellowships support graduate study for up to 2 years.

Academic Credit

Academic credit is optional but the training program must be "graduate level" in character.

Costs supported

Institutes and short-term training programs

Institution - All direct costs plus indirect costs (up to 8% of sum of direct cost plus participant support).

Participants - For full-time training programs \$75 per week stipend; \$15 per week for each dependent. No travel.

(You will note a non-Federal column on the budget page which offers you the opportunity to become fiscally involved in your training program.)

Fellowships - Each first-year fellow receives a 12-month stipend of \$2400 plus an allowance of \$500 for each dependent. A second-year fellow receives

\$2600 plus dependency allowances. An annual allowance of \$2500 is paid to

the training institution to cover tuition fees and other training costs.

Special Projects - Traditional fellowships and institute programs can be very effective in the training and retraining of higher education personnel,

but if this is the extent of our effort, the ever-increasing manpower needs

of higher education will not be met. The special projects category of

Part E is for imaginative training programs which do not precisely fit the

fellowship or institute structure and which show promise for influencing

institutional change which will result in training programs that represent

a considerable improvement over past practices.

All proposals submitted under Part E must address themselves to the following priorities:

1. Programs to train teachers for junior colleges and two-year community colleges.
2. Programs to prepare educational personnel who will serve in developing colleges or will be concerned with the needs of disadvantaged students.
3. Programs for the improvement of undergraduate teaching at all levels.
4. Programs to train administrators in higher education with important decision-making functions.
5. Programs to train educational specialists.

Because of the limited monies likely to be available for Part E, we

will be able to support only the highest quality proposals that could be

considered as models in relation to critical local, regional, or national manpower needs in higher education. We would also hope to see evidence of "multiplier" or "ripple" effects in the training programs. That is the training of individuals who will influence large numbers of higher education personnel.

In conclusion, I believe the evidences presented in this paper show that the Federal government is interested in the small college. We are looking for you to respond in a dynamic way that will result in a new era for your institutions.